

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- February 23, 1966

Appeal #8612 V. L. Frederick, Appellant

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the following Order was entered at a meeting of the Board on March 4, 1966.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER: April 6, 1966

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the FAR requirements of the CM-2 District to permit an addition to existing building for offices and storage with an FAR not to exceed 4.6 and a variance of the requirements of Section 7206 to permit attendant parking at 2215-17 M Street, N.W., lots 78 and 79, square 50, be granted.

From the records and the evidence adduced at the public hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

- (1) Appellant's lots are located in a C-M-2 District.
- (2) Both lots have a 18 foot frontage on M Street and a 100 foot depth. Lot 78 contains 1884 square feet of land and lot 79 contains 1883 square feet of land.
- (3) Appellant proposes to make an addition to the existing building, and to go up another story beyond the existing building.
- (4) The existing building has no basement. Underground parking presents a physical problem.
- (5) Appellant desires an FAR of 4.6 instead of 4.0.
- (6) Appellant desires 11 parking spaces instead of 10 spaces, attendant parking
- (7) The proposal was presented to the Board by the use of a model explained by the architect.
- (8) There was objection by a neighboring property owner. The letter is on file in this case as Exhibit 3.
- (9) There was no objection to the granting of this appeal registered at the public hearing.

OPINION:

Due to the problem created by the narrow size of the appellant's property, the Board feels the 4.6 FAR is justified. This relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the Zoning Regulations and Map.

Inasmuch as the appellant has shown that underground parking cannot be provided at this site, the Board concludes that the proposed provisions for parking are reasonable and the variance will not likely have adverse effects.